



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/495,708	02/01/2000	Yutaka Kai	1460.1002	5201

21171 7590 07/31/2003

STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

BELLO, AGUSTIN

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2633

DATE MAILED: 07/31/2003

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/495,708	KAI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Agustin Bello	<b>Art Unit</b> 2633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4,7-10 and 13-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 3,5,6,11 and 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 01 February 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
  - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                    | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. Claim 1 recites the limitation "said light detecting means" in line 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
4. Claim 13 recites the limitation "the frequency of said first radio frequency signal" and "the frequency of said second radio frequency signal" in lines 4-6. Claim 13 also recites "the state of polarization" in line 23. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.
5. Claim 14 recites the limitation "The selected-wavelength tuning apparatus" in line 25. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.
6. Claim 17 recites the limitation "The selected-wavelength tuning apparatus" in line 36. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

### ***Drawings***

7. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the third polarization means of claim 16 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Art Unit: 2633

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 13-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terahara (U.S. Patent No. 6,366,379).

Regarding claim 1, Terahara teaches a selected-wavelength tuning apparatus, comprising: an acoustic optical tunable filter (reference numeral 31 in Figure 13) for branching light into selected-wavelength light and light with other wavelengths in accordance with the radio-frequency signal (column 21 lines 43-47); a radio-frequency signal generating means (reference numeral 63 in Figure 13) for generating said radio-frequency signal; a light intensity detecting means for detecting light from said acoustic optical tunable filter (reference numeral 22 in Figure 1); and a radio-frequency signal controlling means (reference numerals 6, 14, 15, 23, 32, 33 in Figure 1) for controlling said radio-frequency signal generating means so as to select light of a predetermined wavelength in accordance with an output of said light detecting means (column 8 lines 6-14). Terahara differs from the claimed invention in that Terahara fails to specifically teach rotating polarization in accordance with a radio-frequency signal in the acousto-optic tunable filter. However, it is obvious but not inherent that the AOTF of Terahara functions by

rotation the polarization in accordance with a radio-frequency signal. For example, Terahara teaches that in an AOTF an input light signal is polarized by a polarization beam splitter, then a wavelength of the signal is rotated by the surface acoustic wave in that the light signal and the surface acoustic wave interfere with one another and only the light signal of part of the wavelength is polarized selectively by surface acoustic wave created by the input of a radio frequency signal. Next, the light signal of the wavelength polarized is polarized and separated by a second polarization beam splitter which allows selection of particular wavelengths. Clearly, the AOTF of Terahara operates according to the same principle of polarization rotation according to an input radio frequency as that claimed by the applicant. Therefore, it would have been obvious but not inherent to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that the AOTF of Terahara operates according to the same principle of polarization rotation according to an input radio frequency.

Regarding claims 2 and 10, Terahara teaches a radio-frequency signal controlling means (reference numeral 6, 14, 15, 23, 33 in Figure 1) comprising a value discriminating means (reference numeral 14 in Figure 1) for discriminating a value of said light intensity with respect to an optical signal of a predetermined wavelength by receiving said light intensity from said light intensity detecting means while changing the frequency of said radio-frequency signal generated by said radio-frequency signal generating means (column 10 lines 61 – column 11 line 5); and a frequency controlling means (reference numeral 14 in Figure 1) for controlling said radio-frequency signal generating means so as to generate the radio-frequency with the frequency which makes a light intensity discriminated by said value discriminating means. Terahara differs from the claimed invention in that Terahara fails to specifically teach that the

discriminating means discriminates for the maximum value or that the radio-frequency generating means generates a frequency that makes the light intensity the maximum value. However, Terahara does provide a means for adjusting the intensity of the radio frequency supplied to the AOTF, thereby dictating the intensity of the light signal (column 8 lines 6-14 and column 20 lines 41-48) for the purpose of compensation for distortions in the signal or to regulate the light intensity of the output signal. One skilled in the art would clearly have recognized that the system of Terahara would have had the ability to maximize the light intensity of the light signal by maximizing the intensity of the RF signal used to control the AOTF. Furthermore, it is likely that the distortion elimination process taught by Terahara would have resulted in a light signal at maximum intensity. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to have maximized the intensity of the light signal in order to eliminate or prevent distortion in the light signal. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have maximized the intensity of the light signal via the feedback method taught by Terahara.

Regarding claim 4, it is clear from the discussion regarding claim 2, that the system of Terahara has the ability to maximize the intensity of the light output from the AOTF. One skilled in the art would clearly have recognized that since the AOTF selects a wavelength to output based on the radio frequency signal input to the AOTF, and the intensity of the output wavelength is governed by the intensity of the radio frequency signal input to the AOTF, the AOTF of Terahara would have been capable of maximizing the light intensity of the output wavelength every time the optical signal of specific wavelength is changed based on the feedback from the spectrum monitor.

Regarding claim 7, Terahara teaches the selected-wavelength tuning apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said light intensity detecting means is an optical spectrum analyzer (reference numeral 1 in Figure 22) for further detecting said light wavelength and said radio-frequency signal controlling means (reference numeral 14 in Figure 1) generates the radio-frequency signal with a known frequency (inherent) and computes the relationship between the selected-wavelength of said AOTF and the radio-frequency based on the output of said optical spectrum analyzer (e.g. the controller observes and determines the state of the RF signal generator on the basis of monitor information, column 8 lines 6-14).

Regarding claim 8, Terahara teaches the selected-wavelength tuning apparatus according to claim 7, further comprising an optical amplifier (reference numeral 70-1 in Figure 7) connected to the optical input side of said AOTF.

Regarding claim 13, Terahara teaches an AOTF which outputs an optical signal of specific wavelength in accordance with the frequency of said first radio-frequency signal and the frequency of said second radio-frequency signal as a first output (column 2 lines 13-20), and outputs light with other wavelengths as a second output (column 1 lines 56-59), comprising: first polarizing means (reference numeral 30'-05 in Figure 25) for branching an optical input into TM and TE mode lights (column 1 lines 50-52); first radio-frequency signal applying means (reference numeral 30'-1 in Figure 25) for applying first radio-frequency signal to a first optical waveguide for propagating the TM mode light branched by said first polarizing means; second radio-frequency signal applying means (reference numeral 30'-1 in Figure 25) for applying second radio-frequency signal to a second optical waveguide for propagating the TE mode light branched by said first polarizing means; and second polarizing means (reference numeral 30'-6

in Figure 25) for multiplexing optical signals from said first optical waveguides to which said first radio-frequency signal has been applied and said second optical waveguides to which said second radio-frequency signal has been applied, and branching them as first and second outputs corresponding to the state of polarization of the light (column 1 lines 56-59).

Regarding claims 14, 17, and 18 Terahara teaches the selected-wavelength tuning apparatus, comprising: AOTF which comprises first polarizing means (reference numeral 30'-05 in Figure 25) for branching an optical input into TM and TE mode lights (column 1 lines 50-52), first radio-frequency signal applying means (reference numeral 30'-1 in Figure 25) for applying first radio-frequency signal to a first optical waveguide which is for propagating the TM mode light branched by said first polarizing means, second radio-frequency signal applying means (reference numeral 30'-1 in Figure 25) for applying second radio-frequency signal to a second optical waveguide for propagating the TE mode light branched by said first polarizing means, and second polarizing means (reference numeral 30'-6 in Figure 25) for multiplexing optical signals from said first optical waveguides to which said first radio-frequency signal has been applied and said second optical waveguides to which said second radio-frequency signal has been applied, and branching them as first and second outputs corresponding to the state of polarization of the light (column 1 lines 56-59); radio-frequency signal generating means (reference numeral 63 in Figure 13) for generating said radio-frequency signal; light intensity detecting means (reference numeral 22 in Figure 1) for detecting the intensity of light from said AOTF; and radio-frequency signal control means (reference numerals 6, 14, 15, 23, 32, 33 in Figure 1) for controlling said radio-frequency generating means so as to select light of a predetermined wavelength in accordance with the output of said light intensity detecting means.

Regarding claim 15, Terahara teaches the selected-wavelength tuning apparatus according to claim 14, wherein said radio-frequency signal applying means are two radio-frequency signal applying means (column 2 lines 13-21), of which the first radio-frequency signal applying means (reference numeral 30'-05 in Figure 25) applies the radio frequency signal to the TM mode light branched by said first polarizing means and the second radio-frequency signal applying means (right side of AOTF filter reference numeral 30'-05 in Figure 25) applies the radio-frequency signal to the TE mode light branched by said first polarizing means and said radio-frequency signal generating means supplies the radio-frequency signals of different frequencies to said first and second radio-frequency signal applying means (inherent).

Regarding claim 16, Terahara teaches that the AOTF filters used in the system can be cascaded (as seen in Figure 19), thereby inherently teaching a third polarization means for branching the lights exited from a first AOTF into TM and TE modes. Terahara also teaches the claimed invention (including intensity detection means) except for first and second intensity detection means. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included a plurality of light intensity detection means for detecting the intensity of the TE and TM mode lights, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

Regarding claim 19, Terahara teaches the optical add/drop multiplexer according to claim 18, in which a plurality of acoustic optical tunable filters are connected in tandem (see Figure 19).

Art Unit: 2633

10. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terahara in view of Aronson (U.S. Patent No. 5,452,314).

Regarding claim 9, Terahara differs from the claimed invention in that Terahara fails to specifically teach a plurality of said acoustic optical tunable filters are formed on the same single substrate and temperature controlling means for controlling temperature of the plurality of said acoustic optical tunable filters to be the same. However, Aronson, in the same field of endeavor, teaches it is well known in the art to form a plurality of tunable filters on a single substrate (column 5 lines 3-9) and to include a temperature controlling means (column 5 lines 36-41) for controlling temperature of the plurality of said acoustic optical tunable filters. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to have formed a plurality of tunable filters on a single substrate and to have included a temperature controlling means for controlling temperature of the plurality of said acoustic optical tunable filters in order to reduce the overall size of the system and to maintain the operation of the filters at a nominal temperature, respectively. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have formed a plurality of tunable filters on a single substrate and to have included a temperature controlling means for controlling temperature of the plurality of said acoustic optical tunable filters.

11. Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terahara in view of Robinson (U.S. Patent No. 5,452,314).

Regarding claims 20 and 22, Terahara teaches an AOTF (reference numeral 31 in Figure 13) for rotating polarization in accordance with a radio-frequency signal and for branching light into selected-wavelength light and light with other wavelengths in accordance with the radio-frequency signal; light intensity detecting means (reference numeral 22 in Figure 1) for detecting

Art Unit: 2633

the intensity of the light from said AOTF; radio-frequency signal controlling means (reference numeral 6, 14, 15, 23, 32, 33 in Figure 1) for controlling said radio-frequency signal generating means so as to select light of a predetermined wavelength in accordance with the output of said light intensity detecting means. Terahara differs from the claimed invention in that Terahara fails to specifically teach a storage means for storing the frequencies of said radio-frequency signal that changes and light intensity detected by said light intensity detecting means with respect to the frequency. However, the use or a storage means in optical communication system and AOTF systems is very well known in the art. Robinson, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a system wherein AOTF are used to filter selected wavelengths and storage means (column 23 line 62- column 24 line 30) is used to store the frequencies of said radio-frequency signal that changes and the intensity information detected by the intensity detection means of the system. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to have used a storage means to store the frequencies of said radio-frequency signal that changes and intensity of the selected wavelengths in order to track the effects of certain frequencies on certain intensities. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have included a storage means in the device of Terahara as taught by Robinson.

Regarding claim 21, the combination of Terahara and Robinson differs from the claimed invention in that Terahara fails to specifically teach a rejecting means for rejecting the light exited from said AOTF. However, rejecting means are very well known in the art. For example optical isolators are well known to be used to prevent light propagating in a reverse direction. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to have used a rejecting means for rejecting the light exited from said AOTF in order to prevent light from reflecting back into the AOTF,

thereby preventing damage to the AOTF. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have included a rejecting means for rejecting the light exited from said AOTF in the device of the combination of Terahara and Robinson.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

12. Claims 3 and 5-6, 11, 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Olshanky, Ryan, Wilner, Ball, and Onaka teach relevant art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Agustin Bello whose telephone number is (703)308-1393. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on (703)305-4729. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)872-9314 for regular communications and (703)872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

AB  
July 28, 2003

  
LESLIE PASCAL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER